

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 17, 20, 23, 26, and 30 have been amended. Claim 8 has been canceled. Support for the amendments may be found at least in paragraph 23 on page 8 of the application as originally filed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 12-17, 20-23, and 26-30

Claims 1-6, 12-17, 20-23, and 26-30 stand rejected as being obvious in view of Sohn (2003/0202592), Carlbom (2003/0033318), Guo (6,353,678), and Hanami (6,765,965). Applicant does not admit that Sohn is prior art and reserves the right to challenge the reference at a later date.

Sohn teaches a system in which frames of video data may be encoded using disparity vectors, motion vectors, or both. When encoding with disparity vectors, a disparity vector is generated from a reference frame in conjunction with a destination frame. When the frame is subsequently decoded, the reference frame is used in conjunction with the disparity vector to recreate the destination frame.

Carlbon teaches tracking the flight of a ball across multiple cameras. Once Carlbon identifies the location of the ball, Carlbon dynamically shrinks the size of the search region and relies upon the velocity of the ball and the known physical coordinates of the cameras to continue tracking the ball.

Guo teaches computation of constrained epipolar transformations for image pairs. Constraints are iteratively tightened for objects in motion in a three dimensional scene.

Hanami teaches using more than one motion detecting units. Each motion detecting unit uses a different number of estimation pixels.

As amended, claim 1 recites constraining a search range using a first correlation between efficient compression and semantic accuracy. The search range is also constrained using a disparity vector computed using a stereo algorithm. The first correlation is received from a user, and used to adjust the height of the constrained search range. The search range, as constrained by the first correlation and the disparity vector, is used to search a second frame for one or more pixels that match the one or more pixels identified in a first frame.

Claim 1 also recites receiving a second correlation between efficient compression and semantic accuracy from the user and searching a third frame using a search range constrained using the second correlation for one or more matching pixels.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner takes the position that any constrained disparity search inherently represents some desired correlation between efficient coding and semantic accuracy. However, none of the four cited references teaches receiving a desired correlation between efficient coding and semantic accuracy from a user. Rather, the combination teaches what the Examiner has alleged as inherent: that, by definition, a constrained search

includes **some** correlation, or a correlation is derived by iterative operation of the system. However, the amended claim 1 recites a correlation **received from a user**. The correlation in claim 1 is not a byproduct of how a system is implemented, but rather represents a specified correlation received from a user. The combination fails to teach this element. Accordingly, the combination does not render claim 1 obvious.

Claims 12, 17, 20, and 26, as amended, recite similar, but not identical, elements as in claim 1 and are therefore patentable over the combination for similar reasons to those stated above. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

Claims 8-11, 19, 25, and 31

Claims 8-11, 19, 25, and 31 stand rejected as being obvious in view of the base combination of Sohn, Carlbom, Guo, and Hanami and Newman (6,154,600).

Newman teaches a user interface that allows users to modify parameters of an imaging processing application.

Claims 8-11, 19, 25, and 31 depend upon independent claims 1, 12, 20, and 26, which are patentable over the base combination for the reasons stated above. Newman fails to correct the shortcomings of the base combination. While Newman teaches allowing user modification of parameters, none of the references, including Newman, teaches that a correlation between coding efficiency and semantic accuracy can be modified by a user. Thus, the base

combination and Newman together do not teach the correlation received from a user as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

SUMMARY

If the Examiner determines that the prompt allowance of these claims can be expedited by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe Sosinski at (408) 962-7585.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: February 10, 2010

/Joseph W. Sosinski/
Joseph W. Sosinski
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 62,807

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040